

EXHIBIT 17

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION MDL No. 2804
OPIATE LITIGATION Case No. 17-md-2804

This document relates to: Judge Dan
Aaron Polster

The County of Cuyahoga v. Purdue
Pharma, L.P., et al.
Case No. 17-OP-45005

City of Cleveland, Ohio vs. Purdue
Pharma, L.P., et al.
Case No. 18-OP-45132

The County of Summit, Ohio,
et al. v. Purdue Pharma, L.P.,
et al.
Case No. 18-OP-45090

VOLUME I
Videotaped Deposition of Kyle J. Wright
Washington, D.C.
February 28, 2019
9:33 a.m.

Reported by: Bonnie L. Russo
Job No. 3244302

1 objection was to his question?

2 MR. SHKOLNIK: Yes.

3 MR. O'CONNOR: All right.

4 BY MR. O'CONNOR:

5 Q. With respect to the suspicious
6 orders that were reported to DEA, is it fair to
7 say that there were a large number of false
8 positives?

9 MR. BENNETT: Objection to form.

10 THE WITNESS: Because a suspicious,
11 there could be a false positive. As to the
12 quantity, I cannot stipulate.

13 BY MR. O'CONNOR:

14 Q. Isn't it true that there were a
15 large number of suspicious orders that were
16 reported to DEA that were not, in fact, likely
17 to be diverted?

18 MR. BENNETT: Objection to the form.

19 THE WITNESS: I know --

20 BY MR. O'CONNOR:

21 Q. You can answer the question.

22 A. I know that there was a quantity.
23 As to the extent of that quantity being large
24 or not large, I don't know.

25 MR. O'CONNOR: All right. I'm going